

May 28

phoned every day; of his wife and children, of his colleagues and competitors. And this uncorrupted heart, broken or no, is what is likely to be remembered of him in this great city and at Dartmouth, his other home.

FRIENDS, NOT SPEECHES

The obit writers had a hard weekend with Orv because they kept hunting for him in the files and of course he wasn't there. He didn't make speeches, he made friends. This last time I saw him, he was breathing hard but still worrying about everybody else's worries and insisting that everybody get a good rest after the long strike.

Most of the time, it is the heart that governs understanding, and understanding was his special quality. He not only understood human frailty and almost preferred it. He understood the sensitive pride and combative instincts of reporters and editors, which is not easy. He even understood the anxieties of the printers during the time of our troubles.

Throughout the whole ghastly period, when he wore his life away, he was again worrying about other people, this time about those who were on the street with no work and those who were in the office with too much work. He was running the office by day and often negotiating far into the night. Even when his heart began to rebel and the doctors put him on digitalis to regulate it, nobody knew what was going on but his family.

AND NEVER CAME BACK

When the strike was over he finally slipped away to the hospital and never came back.

This quality of concern for others is vital to the tradition of the Times. A newspaper is a very special kind of partnership. The main ingredients are not newsprint ink and advertising, but the more volatile human ingredients of blood, brains, pride, and courage. This is why understanding is so important at the top, and why Adolph Ochs, Arthur Sulzberger and Orvil Dryfoos, having understanding, were so good at it. For they saw a newspaper, as Edmund Burke saw a nation, not only as a partnership of the living, but as a partnership "between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born."

There should be some consolation for us all, believer and unbeliever alike, in this thought. Orvil Dryfoos had this special sense of trusteeship to a marked degree. He thought of himself, as his father-in-law did before him, as one of a team working for an ideal larger than himself, of carrying on for a time something he devoutly believed to be important. And he not only carried it higher up the hill, but expanded its influence across the continent and planted a new edition of the Times beyond the Rockies. Thus, he achieved his ideal much more than most men are able to do, and remains a part of an institution that will go on as long as men are faithful to its ideals.

THEY MUST CARRY ON

I never thought much of the family joke that Arthur Sulzberger and Orvil Dryfoos "married the New York Times." The women they married were so much better than any newspaper. Besides, it was the women who married them, and what is important now, bore them the children who must carry on.

Their fathers have given them a good lead. It is summed up for me in a quote from Robert Burns. He said "whatever mitigates the woes or increases the happiness of others—this is my criterion of goodness. And whatever injures society at large, or any individual in it—this is my measure of iniquity."

Orvil Dryfoos lived by this noble ideal, but knew that ideals, and traditions, are not self-enforcing. Somebody must decide, in the newspaper business. In no other institution are so many choices offered every day of the year. In no other craft are there so many

men with so many diverse ideas on so many subjects, about which so much can be said. But the tyranny of the deadline is always present, and while most of these decisions are made on the desk, the big ones have to be made at the top.

MAN OF BIG DECISIONS

Here, Orvil Dryfoos was equal to his duty. I will always remember him in the city room on election night of 1960 when he was this first to sense that we had gone out on a limb for Kennedy too early and insisted that we reconsider. And again, in 1961, when we were on the point of reporting a premature invasion of Cuba, his courteous questions and wise judgment held us back.

He had his weaknesses, like all of us, but usually they sprang from the more amiable qualities of the human spirit. To hurt a colleague was an agony for him, and in this savage generation, when men decide, other men often get hurt. But he could make up his mind. He suffered, but he acted.

Perhaps the simplest thing to say about him—and I believe I speak for my colleagues in this—is that the more we knew him, the more we respected him. He was a gentleman. He was faithful to a noble tradition, to the family from which he came, and to the great family he joined and loved.

Martin Buber once said "if we could hang all our sorrows on pegs, and were allowed to choose those we liked best, everyone of us would take back his own, for all the rest would seem more difficult to bear."

Let us, then, honor Orvil Dryfoos with remembrance rather than with tears. For his children will never be able to cry as much as he has made them laugh.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HAYS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so to ask the gentleman a question. Yesterday the gentleman in a 1-minute speech made an attack on the President which I felt was unwarranted as a matter of opinion. I got up and said so. Then later the gentleman took his remarks out of the RECORD; at least, they did not appear. Is the gentleman going to leave in the RECORD the remarks he is going to make today?

Mr. ALGER. The gentleman assures the gentleman from Ohio that the remarks will be in the RECORD. I forgot them. I left them out because I wanted to use the summary of the Senate Preparedness Committee, which was in my office and since the gentleman has brought it up, I will include in the body of the RECORD today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I failed to put in the RECORD yesterday, which I forgot, not my secretary, appear in the body of the RECORD today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The remarks referred to are as follows:

PRESIDENT WITHHOLDS INFORMATION PUTTING U.S. SECURITY IN DANGER

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet military buildup in Cuba poses a serious

threat to the security of the United States. In withholding information from the people, the President is not fully protecting the United States from this military threat, and is misleading the trusting American people.

We now have the authority of a bipartisan committee of the U.S. Senate which reports new military moves in Cuba by the Soviet Union and charges that no apparent effort to get the Russian troops out of Cuba or the instigation of States for practical inspection to insure against new missile bases in Cuba.

any move on the part of the United

Here is the summary of the findings of the bipartisan committee—Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate—on the Cuban military buildup:

SUMMARY OF THREAT ARISING FROM SOVIET PRESENCE IN CUBA

Our summary of the threat and potential threat which the Soviet presence in Cuba presents to the Americas is as follows:

1. Cuba is an advanced Soviet base for subversive, revolutionary, and agitational activities in the Western Hemisphere and affords the opportunity to export agents, funds, arms, ammunition, and propaganda throughout Latin America.

2. Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity.

3. Cuba serves as an advance intelligence base for the U.S.S.R.

4. The potential exists to establish electronic warfare capabilities based on Cuba.

5. The vital Panama Canal could be the target for sneak raids originating from Cuba.

6. Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the southeast United States and the Caribbean.

7. Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery airbases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union.

8. Advanced Soviet submarine bases could be established in Cuban ports with very little effort.

9. The continued presence of the Soviets in Cuba could require a further reorientation of the U.S. air defenses.

10. Cuba provides a base for the training of agents from other Latin American countries in subversive, revolutionary, agitational, and sabotage techniques.

11. The very presence of the Soviets in Cuba affects adversely our Nation's image and prestige. Our friends abroad will understandably doubt our ability to meet and defeat the forces of communism thousands of miles across the ocean if we prove unable to cope with the Communist threat at our very doorstep.

A consideration of all these matters serves to emphasize the gravity of the threat to our national security which Cuba now represents.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious charges and I do not see how the President can ignore the military danger to our Nation. I cannot understand a Commander in Chief who, in withholding information from the people misleads them into a sense of false security. President Kennedy is assuming for himself a grave and dangerous responsibility in such actions. As the Soviet net tightens in this hemisphere and the military threat to our

Commission have been acknowledged widely by the daily press, and it is my privilege of including as a part of my remarks two examples of such acknowledgments.

On behalf of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to wish Mr. Minow Godspeed and success in his future endeavors. I, personally, regret that for reasons of his own he was unable to continue in public office. I am sure he will be missed. However, in saying goodbye to Mr. Minow I want to welcome his successor, Mr. E. William Henry, and I want to express a hope that he will carry on the good work performed by Mr. Minow during his tenure in office.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 18, 1963]

MR. MINOW'S RATING

The story is told that after he had sworn in Newton Minow, President Kennedy said in an earnest aside, "Newt, we expect you to do something about getting better television shows." The record discloses that Mr. Minow has done just about everything the laws allow to encourage a change of scenery on the screen that he called "a vast wasteland." In his 2 years as chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Minow has made the quality of broadcasting a national issue. This will surely guarantee him a high rating for service on a scale more exacting than that employed by Trendex.

A gifted controversialist, Mr. Minow showed a zest for combat and a skill with phrases that forced broadcasters to reconsider their responsibilities to the public. The laws do not permit the FCC to act as a censor, but they do not prevent the chairman from speaking his mind. Mr. Minow left no doubts about his views on the dreary programs and caterwauling commercials that constitute so much of TV's "Bland Old Opera."

How much effect did his campaign have on broadcasting? Opinions differ. Defensive industry spokesmen insist that the increase in public service programs antedated Mr. Minow's arrival in Washington, and they note wryly that TV's most popular show is now "The Beverly Hillbillies." Yet there is no doubt that Mr. Minow's hectoring prodded an industry too often bemused by size of audience and magnitude of profit; if there was an existing tendency to improve TV, the chairman's repeated salvos accelerated the pace.

In concrete terms, Mr. Minow did succeed in freeing channel 13 in New York for educational purposes, and the station may yet become the flagship of a national educational network. His advocacy before Congress helped win passage for bills creating the Telstar Corp., providing Federal help for educational stations, and requiring set manufacturers to build all-channel receivers beginning on June 1, 1964. Under his chairmanship, the FCC authorized tests of pay TV, tightened up reviewing procedures for license renewals, and for the first time moved effectively into regulation of interstate telephone rates—the new \$1 long-distance rate is a product of his efforts.

This record sets an exacting standard for the new FCC chairman, E. William Henry, a young Commissioner who also appears to believe in energetic leadership. "The idol of majority approval," Mr. Henry said recently, "must not be worshiped by the networks to the complete exclusion of the public's need for variety and the creative artist's need for an outlet for his talents." Under

Chairman Henry, and fortified by the anti-trust background of Lee Loewinger, who has left the Justice Department to fill the vacancy on the FCC, the Commission should be faithful to its ultimate sponsor—the American public.

[From the Little Rock (Ark.) Gazette, May 18, 1963]

MINOW TAKES THE LAST STAGE FROM TOMBSTONE

It may be truly said of anyone having anything to do with the production of an encyclopedia that his work is never done. To Newton Minow, however, his new connection with the Britannica may take on some of the aspects of a rest cure when he looks back upon his tour as FCC Chairman, a labor which, seriously entered into, is roughly comparable to that of Sisyphus, with some overtones of Hercules in Augean stables.

Mr. Minow came to the Commission more than 2 years ago with his widely quoted description of commercial TV broadcasting as a "vast wasteland." Is the wasteland today any less vast for his brief passage? The safest sort of nonanswer would be to speculate upon what things would be like if Mr. Minow had never made the scene, or had brought to his task the attitude of a time-server rather than that of goad and gadfly.

Our own summary judgment is that network informational programs are the best ever, a development for which the retiring FCC Chairman can claim some indirect credit.

For the rest of it, though, the programming panorama is as evocative of "Death Valley Days" as ever, with perhaps even more weathered jawbones in view. Indeed, one of Mr. Minow's troubles was that he was never sure from day to day that the next skull he picked up wouldn't be his own. The broadcasters didn't "get" Newton Minow; he had the full support of the Kennedy administration all the way, and the choice of a successor, the young Memphis lawyer, E. William Henry, is proof enough that the administration hasn't given up on its determination to do something about radio and TV broadcasting. But what the broadcasting industry can do, by exerting unrelenting pressure, is to make it that much easier for a man to decide to leave public service for the Encyclopaedia Britannica at four or five times his present rate of pay.

The big question Mr. Minow will leave behind him is not whether he personally did enough to raise the broadcasting industry's cultural and ethical standards. He certainly did all he could. The question, rather, is whether much of anything can be done about raising the broadcasting industry's standards, given the existing system under which so-called entertainment programs are conceived and spanked into life, if only as a necessary prelude to infantride.

Commerce Committee Chairman OWEN HARRIS, of Arkansas, has done valuable work in exposing some of the more obvious TV and radio rating services. But once these flaws have been exposed, where do we go from there? If the rating services did not exist, the industry would be forced to invent them again, for where else would the networks and agencies turn to avoid the necessity of making their own decisions as to quality and taste or to blame the rest of us for their own lack of taste and judgment?

Newton Minow will leave the TV scene at the height of the age of the "spin-off," a form of parthenogenesis by which one "Beverly Hillbillies" this season becomes two such series the next and perhaps three or four the season after that, until, finally, our stomach—if not our brains—can stand no more.

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas for bringing to the attention of this House the departure of Newton N. Minow as Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. There is no Member of this Congress who knows more about Federal communication problems than the gentleman who just spoke in the well of the House.

I join with him in this tribute to Mr. Minow as he leaves the FCC and goes back to private life. Heading almost any agency of this vast Federal Government is a difficult task but it is infinitely more difficult when that agency touches the pulse and feelings of so many people across our land. Newton Minow met the challenge and he met it with courage and determination. He stirred to the depths the great broadcasting industry; and it is my judgment that this fantastic communication medium is the better for Chairman Minow's words and deeds. He, indeed, has been a good and a great public servant and President Kennedy can take pride in his appointment and the service he rendered. I give my own congratulations to him and I add my sincere wish that the future will be as exciting as the past and that his gracious wife, Jo, and his lovely children and Newton Minow will have many, many years of happiness, health, and prosperity as they leave the official Washington scene.

THE LATE ORVIL E. DRYFOOS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in the death of Orvil E. Dryfoos, I have lost a friend whom I have known since our student days at Dartmouth College. I have always been aware of his purposefulness and of his devotion to the causes which he thought worthwhile.

In particular, as an alumnus of Dartmouth College, I take this opportunity to pay tribute to his long and devoted service to that historic institution.

James Reston, the distinguished columnist of the New York Times who gave the eulogy at Orvil Dryfoos' funeral, has eloquently summed up the character and achievements of our friend, and I insert Mr. Reston's eulogy herewith as a permanent tribute to Orvil E. Dryfoos:

A EULOGY FOR ORVIL DRYFOOS

The death of Orvil Dryfoos was blamed on heart failure, but that, obviously, could not have been the reason. Orv Dryfoos' heart never failed him or anybody else. Ask the reporters on the Times. It was steady as the stars. Ask anybody in this company of friends. It was faithful and kind. Ask his beloved wife and family. No matter what the doctors say, they cannot blame his heart.

In the spiritual sense, his heart was not a failure but his greatest success. He had room in it for every joy and everybody else's joy. This was the thing that set him apart—this warmth and purity of spirit, this consideration of his mother, whom he tele-

own land becomes greater, he alone must be held responsible.

It will not be enough for the President to say later that he misjudged the Soviet intention. His remorse after the Soviet military might is loosed upon the United States will hardly be sufficient to atone for a war which can be prevented if he takes immediate and forceful action now.

Mr. President, I call upon you to trust the American people with the facts. They are your strength, not the timid advisers who, in their eagerness to accommodate the Soviet Union, weaken the strength and security of the United States. As a Member of Congress of the United States and in the name of the people of the Fifth District of Texas who have given me the responsibility of being their voice in Congress, I call upon you to stop this suicidal course of accommodation of the enemy and take all necessary steps now to end the military threat to the United States by reimposing at once the Monroe Doctrine, halting all shipments of strategic material to Cuba, and setting a time and date for the complete removal of all Russian troops and missiles from Cuba.

Mr. President, the sacred oath you took to defend the United States against all its enemies, precludes the present course you are following which seems to express more concern for the accommodation of the Soviet Union than in the protection of our own land.

For a report on the findings of the subcommittee of the other body as to the military threat from Cuba, I refer you to the following column by David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star of May 20:

**CUBA HELD MAJOR THREAT TO UNITED STATES—
SENATE GROUP'S REPORT EXPLORES DANGER
OF RED ATTACK FROM ISLAND**

(By David Lawrence)

The greatest danger to the security of the United States today is in Cuba. There is enough Soviet military strength remaining on the island to launch an attack on this country.

Yet the American people are being led to believe that Soviet military strength in Cuba is negligible and that an attack is as unthinkable as the missile buildup last year was supposed to be.

This was the reasoning used by Government agencies here in the autumn of 1962 to minimize the meaning of the Soviet troop movement and of the preliminary steps for the setting up of missile bases.

The most important official document on the Cuban situation has received only passing attention in the last 11 days from the American people. No announcement has been made of what the Kennedy administration intends to do about the facts that have just been disclosed. There are no signs that the Soviet Government is being prodded to get its troops, technicians, and military equipment out of Cuba, or that any demand is being made to permit on-the-spot inspection in order to find out whether any missiles are still concealed inside the island.

The latest word to the American people about the gravity of the Cuban situation comes not from Republican critics trying to make a political issue but from a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate headed by a Democratic chairman, Senator JOHN STENNIS, of Mississippi. All seven members—four Democrats and three Republicans—signed the unanimous report. It tells the unvarnished truth

about what has happened and points out a lesson for the future. Here are some extracts from the report, dated May 9, which was written after hearing for many weeks secret testimony given by the intelligence agencies of the Government, civilian and military:

"While a reasonably competent job was done in acquiring and collecting intelligence information and data, in retrospect it appears that several substantial errors were made by the intelligence agencies in the evaluation of the information and data which was accumulated.

"Even though the intelligence community believes that all (strategic missiles) have been withdrawn, it is of the greatest urgency to determine whether or not strategic missiles are now concealed in Cuba. The criticality of this is illustrated by the fact that, assuming maximum readiness at pre-selected sites, with all equipment prelocated, the Soviet mobile medium-range—1,100 miles—missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours.

"Some other sources—primarily refugee and exile groups—estimate that as many as 40,000 Soviets are now in Cuba. Bearing in mind the lack of hard evidence on the question and the substantial underestimation of last fall, we conclude that no one in official U.S. circles can tell with any real degree of confidence, how many Russians are now in Cuba and we are of the opinion that the official 17,500 estimate is perhaps a minimum figure.

"The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, spurring, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere and that such activities present a grave and ominous threat to the peace and security of the Americas.

"It is agreed that ironclad assurance of the complete absence of Soviet strategic missiles in Cuba can come only as a result of thorough, penetrating, on-site inspection by reliable observers.

"The importance of making every effort to ascertain this truth with respect to this matter cannot be overemphasized. The criticality of it can best be illustrated by the fact that the testimony established that, upon the assumption that all missiles and associated equipment and the necessary personnel were readily available near pre-selected sites in a state of complete readiness, mobile medium-range missiles could be made operational in a matter of hours. Thus, if these missiles and their associated equipment remain in Cuba, the danger is clear and obvious.

"Assuming without deciding that all strategic weapons have been withdrawn, there is the ever-present possibility of the stealthy reintroduction of strategic missiles and other offensive weapons, using the Soviet forces still in Cuba as camouflage and security for the activity.

"Potentially, Cuba is a base from which the Soviets could interdict our vital air and sea lanes. It can now be used for the air, sea, and electronic surveillance of our military activities in the Southeast United States and the Caribbean.

"Cuba's airfields could serve as recovery air bases for planes launched against the United States from the Soviet Union."

This means that the range of certain Soviet military planes has been increased substantially. They need fly only one way in a surprise attack, drop bombs on the United States and land in Cuba.

Yet in the last few weeks nothing has been done to insist upon on-site inspection in Cuba by the United Nations or by any other agency. The Kennedy administration has retreated on this point, and only an informed public opinion in the United States and throughout the world can bring about an advance—to verify what has actually happened.

Mr. ALGER. Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. I would like to announce to the membership that when the special orders are in order I have a 60-minute special order. I invite all those present and anyone else interested to be present here, as I intend to discuss capitalism, U.S. sovereignty, and the republican form of government, and at the same time answer to the best of my ability the attacks levied recently on the floor of this House against the Americans for Constitutional Action. I invite my colleagues to be present.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL LIBRARY

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent up to the Congress, Reorganization Plan 1 of 1963 which would transfer certain house-keeping functions with respect to the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park from the Department of the Interior to the General Services Administration.

I have introduced today two measures—one a joint resolution to accelerate the effective date of that plan providing that it would take effect 10 days after the adoption of the joint resolution and, second, a bill which incorporates the provisions of the plan.

This morning I appeared before the Committee on Rules in opposition to the extension of the Reorganization Act for 2 years which has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Government Operations, and I intend in the special order that has been granted to me for today to discuss the propriety of the Congress taking action at this time to extend the Reorganization Act.

THE LATE ORVIL E. DRYFOOS, PRESIDENT AND PUBLISHER OF THE NEW YORK TIMES

(Mr. REID of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise with sadness in my heart over the death of a friend and colleague early Saturday morning, Orvil E. Dryfoos, president and publisher of the New York Times.

Those of us on the Herald Tribune, who had the privilege of working with him, knew him as a man of humility, a man who had a deep concern for people, and a man whose warmth of heart was evident for all to see.

Orvil Dryfoos served in the great tradition of the New York Times, in the tradition of Adolph Ochs. He worked in close association with Arthur Sulzberger. He recognized the vital impor-

tance of the news and the importance of fair and full coverage. He extended the coverage of the New York Times and of its European edition. He started publication of its western edition. Above all, he recognized that the foundation stone of our democracy rests on an enlightened and fully informed public opinion.

I would like to offer my condolences to his family and to the members of the New York Times. In the extension of my remarks I include the eloquent, simple, and moving eulogy of James Reston, chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times which was delivered yesterday morning at the funeral services of Orvil Dryfoos at Temple Emanuel.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 28, 1963]

TEXT OF EULOGY OF ORVIL E. DRYFOOS
DELIVERED BY JAMES RESTON

REMARKS ON A FRIEND

The death of Orvil Dryfoos was blamed on heart failure, but that obviously could not have been the reason. Orv Dryfoos' heart never failed him or anybody else—ask the reporters on the Times. It was steady as the stars—ask anybody in this company of friends. It was faithful as the tides—ask his beloved wife and family. No matter what the doctors say, they cannot blame his heart.

In the spiritual sense, his heart was not a failure, but his greatest success. He had room in it for every joy and everybody else's joy. This was the thing that set him apart—this warmth and purity of spirit, this consideration, of his mother, whom he telephoned every day, of his wife and children, of his colleagues and competitors. And this uncorrupted heart, broken or no, is what is likely to be remembered of him in this great city and at Dartmouth, his other home.

The obit writers had a hard weekend with Orv because they kept hunting for him in the files and, of course, he wasn't there. He didn't make speeches, he made friends. The last time I saw him, he was breathing hard but still worrying about everybody else's worries and insisting that everybody get a good rest after the long strike.

Most of the time, it is the heart that governs understanding, and understanding was his special quality. He not only understood human frailty but almost preferred it. He understood the sensitive pride and combative instincts of reporters and editors, which is not easy. He even understood the anxieties of the printers during the time of our troubles.

NEWSPAPER A PARTNERSHIP

Throughout that whole ghastly period, when he wore his life away, he was again worrying about other people, this time about those who were on the street with no work, and those who were in the office with too much work. He was running the office by day and often negotiating far into the night. Even when his heart began to rebel and the doctors put him on digitalis to regulate it, nobody knew what was going on but his family. When the strike was over, he finally slipped away to the hospital and never came back.

This quality of concern for others is vital to the tradition of the Times. A "newspaper is a very special kind of partnership. The main ingredients are not newsprint, ink, and advertising, but the more volatile human ingredients of blood, brains, pride, and courage."

This is why understanding is so important at the top, and why Adolph Ochs, Arthur Sulzberger, and Orvil Dryfoos, having understanding, were so good at it. For they saw a newspaper, as Edmund Burke saw a

nation, not only as a partnership of the living, but as a partnership "between those who are living, those who are dead, and those who are to be born."

There should be some consolation for us all, believer and unbeliever alike, in this thought. Orvil Dryfoos had this special sense of trusteeship to a marked degree. He thought of himself, as his father-in-law did before him, as one of a team working for an ideal larger than himself, of carrying on for a time something he devotedly believed to be important. And he not only carried it higher up the hill, but expanded its influence across the continent and planted a new edition of the Times beyond the Rockies. Thus he achieved his ideal much more than most men are able to do, and remains a part of an institution that will go on as long as men are faithful to its ideals.

I never thought much of the family joke that Arthur Sulzberger and Orvil Dryfoos "married the New York Times." The women they married were so much better than any newspaper. Besides, it was the women who married them, and what is important now, bore them the children who must carry on.

Their fathers have given them a good lead. It is summed up for them—and I ask the children to remember it—in a quote from Robert Burns. He said: "Whatever mitigates the woes or increases the happiness of others—this is my criterion of goodness. And whatever injures society at large, or any individual in it—this is my measure of iniquity."

PERCEPTIVE JUDGMENT

Orvil Dryfoos lived by this noble ideal, but knew that ideals and traditions are not self-enforcing. Somebody must decide in the newspaper business. In no other institution are so many choices offered every day of the year. In no other craft are there so many men with so many diverse ideas on so many subjects, about which so much can be said. But the tyranny of the deadline is always present, and while most of these decisions are made on the desk, the big ones have to be made at the top.

Here Orvil Dryfoos was equal to his duty. I will always remember him in the city room on election night of 1960 when he was first to sense that we had gone out on a limb for Kennedy too early and insisted that we reconsider. And again in 1961 when we were on the point of reporting a premature invasion of Cuba his courteous questions and wise judgment held us back.

He had his weaknesses, like all of us, but usually they sprang from the more amiable qualities of the human spirit. To hurt a colleague was an agony for him, and in this savage generation, when men decide, other men often get hurt. But he could make up his mind. He suffered, but he acted.

Perhaps the simplest thing to say about him—and I believe I speak for my colleagues in this—is that the more we knew him, the more we respected him. He was a gentleman. He was faithful to a noble tradition, to the family from which he came, and to the great family he joined and loved.

Martin Buber once said: "If we could hang all our sorrows on pegs, and were allowed to choose those we liked best, every one of us would take back his own, for all the rest would seem more difficult to bear."

Let us then honor Orvil Dryfoos with remembrance rather than with tears. For his children will never be able to cry as much as he has made them laugh.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, May 26, 1963]

LEADER OF JOURNALISM PASSES

The newspaper community of New York City—indeed, of the whole Nation—will mourn the death of Orvil Dryfoos, president and publisher of the New York Times. He

had brought youth and vigor to the management of a great institution, as well as the finest traits of fairness, generosity and devotion to the goals of a free press.

The responsibilities he assumed when he took over the direction of the Times 6 years ago were onerous, and he bore them manfully. His qualities of mind and spirit were equal to the challenge, and gave every promise of even broader leadership, not only for his own newspaper but for American journalism in general.

The Herald Tribune extends its deep sympathy to its neighbor, the Times, and especially to the family of Mr. Dryfoos, on their loss. It is one which we share, for it breaks professional and personal associations that were cherished, and deprives the press of a figure in whom every newspaperman could take pride.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, May 27, 1963]

ORVIL E. DRYFOOS

(By Dorothy Schiff)

Orvil Dryfoos, the publisher of the New York Times, was the most unselfish, friendliest, least pretentious of all who met so endlessly last winter during the newspaper strike.

Sensitive to the feelings of others, he was quick to praise and slow to criticize. He remained good-humored and optimistic no matter how trying and exhausting the circumstances. Himself without guile, he always looked for the best in the rest of us and tried to make peace when there was no peace.

He was the nicest person I knew and I share the grief of his family and friends at his premature passing.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 26, 1963]

A QUIET LEADER

The sorrow that today grips acutely every single member of the New York Times organization and has spread itself throughout the world of journalism and beyond is no mere formal tribute to the president and publisher of this newspaper.

It expresses the personal shock and grief of the men and women who worked with Orvil Dryfoos, who admired him, and who loved him for his kindness, his modesty, his integrity and—that most intangible and valuable gift of all—his quality of quiet leadership.

In his more than two decades of intimate association with the Times, Orvil E. Dryfoos had achieved his extraordinary stature through sheer strength of character, through soundness of judgment, through an innate gentleness and pervasive feeling for his fellow man, and through an unfaltering sense of responsibility which conveyed itself to his associates with vigor but without trace of pomp or ostentation. Orvil Dryfoos embodied the highest principles of his profession; and time and again he proved his readiness to carry out those principles no matter what the cost.

When his colleagues talk about him in the corridors of the Times today, and in fact wherever newspapermen gather, one will hear him spoken of as "a fine guy," a "thoughtful person," and "understanding boss." He was all of that but far more than that: a warm and friendly personality, with a most engaging sense of humor; but beneath his genial exterior there was a sensitive understanding of human nature, coupled with the priceless ability to evoke the deepest kind of loyalty from his associates.

It seems incredible that he is taken from us at the age of 50. He had everything to live for; and we at the Times looked forward to many years of his effective leadership—just how effective few people outside the Times could possibly have realized. We shall

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A3425

welcome statement was made in early April by President Kennedy in a message to Congress on foreign aid. He not only stressed the importance of an increased role for private investment, making it one of the six form I objectives of his program, but he followed this with a promise of specific legislative recommendations. The President's promise was followed by announcement of a concrete proposal for a tax credit amounting to 30 percent of new investment in developing countries.

It is my contention that the situation would not have deteriorated to this point had our Government, from the beginning, taken American business into more active partnership in this vital venture. Advisory committees are not enough. Their advice can be, and too often is, ignored. What is needed is an institutional framework that will encourage business and government to work closely together. To ask American firms to do business alone with the kind of revolution now going on in Latin America is to ask it to retire from the scene. To ask government to do it alone is to ask for failure, followed by socialism or worse.

Industry, in my opinion, is ready to respond to a call by the President for a mobilization of its power, skills, and immense knowledge of the area and get behind a drive to make the Alliance for Progress a success. The first step would be the creation of joint Government-industry task forces for those countries ready and willing to set up counterpart teams of their own. Their job would not be to create a master plan for economic and industrial development of that country; the Alliance is already badly bogged down trying to do this. The task forces would have the following three objectives:

1. To recommend measures in each country that would help halt the flight of local and U.S. capital and encourage private investment in productive enterprise.

2. To recommend to the U.S. Government the kind of legal and administrative changes needed to enlist American enterprise in the development of that country on a major scale.

3. To search out specific profitable and employment-creating opportunities that are needed for economic growth and that would attract both local and American investment.

These task forces would have to have policy guidance, administrative direction, and support and immediate access to high enough levels of government so that their recommendations would lead to action instead of talk. The program director should be of top caliber and should report to either an Under Secretary of State or the Administrator of AID. To advise him he should have a board composed of representatives of the government departments concerned with Latin American affairs and an equal number of business and financial leaders experienced in the area.

In each Latin country there is a large nucleus of skilled and patriotic businessmen who are awaiting just this kind of leadership and joint purpose from their giant and successful neighbor to the north. Here at home such a venture would tap a huge reservoir of expert knowledge about the area and sophisticated responsibility toward its development among U.S. corporate and financial institutions. The response is ready, in my opinion, for the challenge.

I would not want to tell you that support of the private sector is all we need to bring Latin America into the modern world. Stable governments are probably more important, since they have an enormous effect on both the public and private sectors—witness the way Brazil was slowed to a halt for months last year while the question of President Goulart's authority was being settled. Social, fiscal, and tax reform are needed, though the

forced draft under which this is being tried pursuant to the terms of the Alliance seems unwise. These reforms will take time. If they are pushed too hard, the result will be both economic and political chaos, not progress.

And the population problem is throttling the rise in per capita income. The Alliance planned for a 5-percent annual increase in gross national product. With an expected 2½-percent rise in population every year, this was supposed to produce a 2½-percent increase in per capita income. But economic growth has, in fact, slowed way down and the rate of the population rise, now the fastest in the world, is turning out to be nearly one-fifth higher than estimated. This has left the average person poorer than ever.

In summing up what I have said tonight, I would like to make the following points:

1. Neither Government nor industry can afford the peril of having on its southern doorstep a population the size of Russia's with comparable natural resources united under the Red flag and dedicated to the proposition that the United States must perish.

2. American business must cooperate with the U.S. Government's objective of raising living standards and keeping communism out of Latin America or else face the possibility that new and more powerful Castros will push all private business out of one of our largest and most promising markets.

3. Our Government must cooperate with industry far more closely than it has in the past, if it wishes to carry out its own objectives. Technical aid and government-to-government programs cannot begin to accomplish the task. What is needed is the active, large-scale assistance of U.S. corporations, the greatest providers of jobs and wealth that man has yet invented.

4. Both Government and industry must bury their ancient myths about each other and unite in the common cause. This will not be easy, for these myths appear to be as durable as those of Karl Marx and Adam Smith about capitalism. They have survived close collaboration during two world wars and innumerable joint projects since. But they are about as useful in running the complex machinery of the modern world as a sledge hammer.

5. We shall have to create imaginative new institutions, such as the country-by-country task forces I have suggested, that will harness the economic power of industry with the political power of government. As equal partners working toward the same goal, we have a reasonable chance of coping with the explosive forces south of the border.

In conclusion let me say that if someone had asked me 3 or 4 years ago whether industry could do business with a revolution, I would have thought even the question ridiculous. Now I am not so sure that the answer is going to be negative. Faced with reality, a national task of sizable dimensions and the known consequences of failure, the American people have always been remarkably resourceful and the American corporation has been ingenious.

No Buildup in Cuba—Or No Intelligence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 20, 1963

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there is still great concern over the

extent of Soviet strength in Cuba. Part of this concern is due to the questionable reputation which our intelligence operations in Cuba have acquired.

I have introduced legislation to establish a joint House-Senate watchdog committee to give regular scrutiny and review to these operations. Strong arguments for such a committee were put forward recently by John S. Knight, publisher of the Miami Herald, one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

I include Mr. Knight's lucid article at this point in the RECORD in order that it may receive the largest possible audience:

NO BUILDUP IN CUBA—OR NO INTELLIGENCE?

VIEWS ON THE NEWS

Last week, I stated here that Soviet military strength in Cuba "is still very formidable."

Mentioned were 42 high performance jet fighters, heavy and medium tanks, anti-tank guns, field artillery pieces, rocket launchers and a minimum of 17,500 military personnel.

But, at the President's news conference on Wednesday last, this colloquy took place:

Question. Mr. President, there's still a lot of discussion in the Congress—Senator LAUSCHE among others—on the increasing buildup militarily of Cuba. Is there anything you can say that would be in any way encouraging about the removal of Russian troops or of the military situation in Cuba?

Answer. We do not have any evidence of increasing military buildup by the Soviet Union. I think at previous press conferences I've given an answer to the question of how many Russians were there, and the comment in regard to the withdrawal of Soviet troops. There has not been a satisfactory withdrawal as yet. But we have no evidence that there is a number coming in larger than going out.

Question. Pardon me, sir, I was thinking more in terms of military equipment going into Cuba.

Answer. Yes, I understand that. We have no evidence that there is an increasing military buildup in Cuba. The intelligence community has not found that."

THEY LOST BECAUSE

In the preceding dialog, the important words to remember are: "The intelligence community has not found that."

This is the same intelligence community which last summer mistook Soviet troops for civilian technicians and estimated Soviet personnel in Cuba at 5,000.

This is the same intelligence community which, notwithstanding human source reports, could not identify the presence in Cuba of Russian-organized ground combat forces until October 25, although some of them had been there since last July.

The preparedness investigating subcommittee of the Senate exonerates the intelligence community of the charge that a gap existed in our photographic reconnaissance over Cuba from September 5 to October 14.

But the committee does say "the deficiency in the performance of the intelligence community appears to have been in the evaluation and assessment of the accumulated data. Moreover, there seems to have been a disinclination on the part of the intelligence community to accept and believe the ominous portent of the information which had been gathered.

"In addition," says the committee, "the intelligence people invariably adopted the most optimistic estimate possible with respect to the information available. This is in sharp contrast to the customary military practice of emphasizing the worst situation which might have been established by the accumulation of evidence."

A3426

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 28

PHILOSOPHICAL?

The Senate subcommittee, on testimony taken from top officials of the CIA and the Pentagon, makes the startling statement that intelligence community analysts "were strongly influenced by their philosophical judgment that it would be contrary to Soviet policy to introduce strategic missiles into Cuba."

The committee says further that the intelligence chiefs acknowledge that they were misled and deceived. The intelligence people now say that all strategic missiles and offensive-weapon systems have been removed. The committee cannot reach a conclusion on this because "of lack of conclusive evidence."

Actually, it will never be known how many weapons are hidden in Cuba without on-site inspection, an early Kennedy objective now forgotten.

So when the President tells the Nation that our intelligence community "has found no evidence of a military buildup in Cuba," we can well ask on the basis of the past record, "How reliable is the information?"

AND NONPARTISAN

I believe the Senate subcommittee, with Senator JOHN STENNIS as chairman, has performed an invaluable service for the country by revealing that—as in the days before Castro—our intelligence evaluations are too often influenced by the philosophical leanings of the evaluators.

It is significant, too, that the full report was unanimously approved by Chairman STENNIS and the full subcommittee, consisting of Democratic Senators STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri; HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington; and STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina; and Republican Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts; MARGARET CHASE SMITH, of Maine, and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

Railroads Need Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 8, 1963

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an interesting statement published by the Association of American Railroads. It is an excellent defense of H.R. 4700, the bill to give railroads the same freedom of competition as to minimum rates now enjoyed by truckers and bargelines. The statement—"Support Fair Competition—Support Low Prices in Transportation," in the form of questions and answers, follows:

S. 1061, H.R. 4700, THE FAIR COMPETITION BILLS

These two identical bills are now pending before the 88th Congress. They will put old-fashioned fair competition to work in transportation.

They are a tiny numerical fraction of our lawmakers' legislative workload, but a major part of their 1963 legislative responsibility to the public.

Why? Let the President answer. "If action is not taken to establish a transportation policy consistent with the new demands upon the economy, we face serious problems of dislocation and deterioration in both the transportation industry and the economic life of the nation which it affects. I urge that action be taken to establish such a

policy." (President John F. Kennedy, in his letter of March 5, 1953, to Senate and House leaders enclosing draft legislation on S. 1061 and H.R. 4700.)

Question. What would this legislation do?

Answer. I would give all carriers the right to lower freight rates without Government approval when they carry agricultural products and bulk commodities. Truckers now have this right when hauling agricultural products and bargelines have this right when carrying bulk commodities such as grain or petroleum—but not the railroads.

S. 1061 and H.R. 4700 would simply extend to railroads some of the competitive freedom already enjoyed by trucks and bargelines. It is no misnomer to call them the fair competition bills for American transportation.

Question. What would these fair competition bills mean to the public?

Answer. It is estimated that nearly \$50 billion of the \$554 billion gross national product in the United States today represents outlays for the transportation of things we produce and consume. Thus, when transportation costs are lowered through increased competition, the person devoting approximately 10 cents of each dollar to freight transportation will enjoy direct benefit.

The bills are a strong weapon against inflation. While virtually all industries are under pressure to raise prices, the railroads want the freedom to reduce them.

Question. What would railroads do if the bills are passed?

Answer. They would reduce more freight rates and pass on to the public more of the savings from technological improvements. A classic case is that of a progressive railroad which developed huge new hopper cars for carrying grain at greatly reduced costs. It has since sought to pass on to the public the benefits from this greater efficiency in the form of 50-percent cuts in freight rates on multiple-car shipments.

Question. How did unequal competition ever get started?

Answer. Basically from the failure of our transportation laws to keep pace with the development of transportation. The Interstate Commerce Commission was created in 1887, so the first Federal controls over railroad freight rates date back into the 19th century. Meanwhile, vast growth occurred in road, water, and air transportation, but different regulatory standards were applied to these new competitors. President Kennedy has stated the problem clearly:

"A chaotic patchwork of inconsistent and often obsolete legislation and regulation has evolved from a history of specific actions addressed to specific problems of specific industries at specific times. This patchwork does not fully reflect either the dramatic changes in technology of the past half-century or the parallel changes in the structure of competition."

Question. Why all the stew about lowering rates?

Answer. This is the weirdest part of all about outdated rate regulation. The public—and Washington, too—clamors for the lowest possible prices. Yet in transportation, lopsided laws have made competition a one-way street. Exempt trucks and bargelines can wheel and deal for traffic at will; when the railroads try to retain or recapture freight shipments by reducing rates in return, however, the public regulator all too often blows the whistle.

Question. Who is in favor of fair competition legislation?

Answer. Only the President of the United States, shippers, farmers, and food processors, consumers, railroads, and practically all fair-minded Americans from every walk of life.

Question. Who opposes the fair competition bills * * * and why?

Answer. Truckers and bargelines who don't

relish fair competition with the railroads. These competitors have thrived behind the regulatory barriers which allow them freedom to lower rates while denying the railroads the same freedom. In the vital struggle for the freight shipment dollar, the postwar market has seen freight volume moving over rivers and canals increase nearly four times, and intercity truck traffic increase nearly three times.

Question. What about regulating everybody—exempting none?

Answer. Few will be misled by the truckers and barge operators' call to extend regulation when too much regulation now is the disease. This is like prescribing wet feet and a strong draft for a man who has caught pneumonia. This industry already suffers from too much regulation. The cure is less—not more. The plain fact is that in a dynamic, diversified economy, there is no workable alternative to less regulation.

Question. But what about opposition warnings of a "monopoly"?

Answer. This is a bogeyman whose horror mask long since disappeared. Railroad's 19th century dominance of American transportation has vanished forever in a top-to-bottom change in traffic positions: Railroads which once stood virtually alone in inland transportation now must fight for business with solidly established highway and waterway carriers, pipelines and airlines and "do-it-yourself" carriers. In 1962, ICC regulated intercity truckers took in more in gross freight revenues than all the Nation's Class I railroads. All intercity trucks put together, including nonregulated and private haulers, accounted for over twice as much freight business as the railroads. Where monopoly once had been possible, monopoly now is impossible.

Question. What protection will be provided against unfair pricing?

Answer. President Kennedy has asked for "the protection of the antitrust laws against any destructive competition." The railroad industry concurs with this objective. Moreover, existing ICC controls against discrimination in railroad ratemaking would be continued, as would those over railroad freight rate increases.

Speech of Hon. Robert Moses, President, New York World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. HEALEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 28, 1963

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the Record, the following excellent speech of the Honorable Robert Moses, president of the New York World's Fair, at the Boy Scout Lunch-O-Ree, in New York City on April 17, 1963:

We recently sent a message to the New York Mirror Annual Youth Forum. Some of what we said about the Fair applies also to the Boy Scouts of America.

The Fair is dedicated to man's achievements on a shrinking globe in an expanding universe, his inventions, discoveries, arts, skills, and aspirations. We aim at an Olympics of progress open to all on equal terms at which friendships will be formed and peace promoted through mutual understanding.

You may say that these are mere words, clichés, exercises in semantics, gestures, slogans, echoing the obvious. Every college